

## **RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE ACTION**

1. Claims 1-11 and 13-25 were rejected under the Judicially-Created Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double patenting over U.S. Patent No. 6,632,886.

A Terminal Disclaimer has been filed with this Amndment and the issue is removed as a matter of law.

2. Claims 12 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Tien et al. (US Patent No. 5,007,945).

The provisio that “with the proviso that when R<sub>1</sub> and R<sub>2</sub> are both bromide atoms, at least one of R<sub>3</sub>, R<sub>4</sub>, R<sub>5</sub> and R<sub>6</sub> is different from hydrogen atom” has been added to claim 12. That proviso has previously established novelty and patentability over the Tien et al. reference and should accomplish that end also with respect to this claim.

This single rejection should be withdrawn as it has been overcome.

Respectfully submitted,

SIMONE ANGIOLINI, et al.

By Their Representatives,

MARK A. LITMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.

York Business Center, Suite 205

3209 West 76<sup>th</sup> Street

Edina, Minnesota 55435

(952) 832-9090

Date: 27 JUNE 2005

By: 

Mark A. Litman Reg. No. 26,390